

Exhibit 4

ATTACHMENT C – BACKGROUND AND SCOPE OF WORK

BACKGROUND

Following the 2000 presidential election in the United States and the ensuing controversy surrounding issues of balloting, then Secretary of State Cathy Cox led the effort to replace the multiple voting systems in use in 159 counties with a uniform solution (the same voting equipment and procedures statewide).

While the current Diebold Direct Recording Electronic (“DRE”) machines deployed in 2002 have given good service to the state, they are reaching the end of their useful life. Additionally, citizens in Georgia and across the nation have become increasingly concerned with election security. Both federal and state officials have been facing questions as to whether DRE machines, as well as other components of Georgia’s voting system, could be compromised. There is not now, or has there ever been, any evidence that Georgia’s voting system has been compromised, or that it has done anything but accurately count the legal votes of citizens who participate in the election process.

In 2017, the Georgia House of Representatives’ Science and Technology Committee (“STC”) held two meetings to discuss the future of Georgia’s voting equipment and overall system. In the first meeting, the Elections Director from the Secretary of State’s Office explained that the current system has worked well, but that Georgia should set a goal of replacing the system by the 2020 election cycle. The second meeting of the STC on this issue included demonstrations of some of the newest solutions available on the market.

The 2018 legislative session saw two bills introduced that were intended to modernize and update Georgia’s voting system and election code: House Bill 680 and Senate Bill 403. While neither of these bills passed, they increased discussion and understanding of the issues involved and the necessity of replacing the existing system.

Following the 2018 legislative session, then Secretary of State Brian Kemp established the Secure, Accessible, & Fair Elections (SAFE) Commission to examine the options for Georgia’s next voting system. The SAFE Commission’s mission was to thoroughly study and discuss all options for Georgia’s next voting system, with a focus on security, transparency, voter experience, accessibility and inclusion, voters’ ability to adjust to and use a new system, and election officials’ ability to adapt to a new system quickly and accurately.

The SAFE Commission’s final report made a series of recommendations that the Georgia General Assembly has used to outline a new Statewide Voting System that includes these major aspects:

1. Georgia should adopt a voting system with a verifiable paper vote record. Every effort should be made to implement this system statewide in time for the 2020 election cycle. The system should create an auditable paper record that the voter has an opportunity to review before casting. Rules should be put in place ensuring a rigorous chain of custody for these paper records, as are in place now for security of paper ballots and memory cards.
2. Georgia should remain a uniform system state, with each county using the same equipment that is initially provided by the state.
3. The implementation of a new system should include a training plan and budget to educate both voters and county election officials.
4. Any new system should ensure that disabled voters have the same opportunity for access and participation as other voters in accordance with the Help America Vote Act (“HAVA”) and the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”). Any new system should be certified by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (“EAC”).
5. Georgia’s new voting system should include new vote casting devices, new scanners, and new electronic poll books. There should be paper backups for each of these systems to the extent possible, including paper registered voter lists and ballots. For each new type of hardware,

Statewide Voting System

eRFP Number: 47800-SOS0000037

steps should be taken to ensure both security and functionality. Any new hardware or software needs to be compatible with Georgia's existing Voter Registration System.

6. Given Georgia's history as a state that uses DREs and the familiarity of voters and election officials with this method of vote casting, Georgia should move to a primarily ballot marking device solution with verifiable paper ballots.
7. Georgia should require post-election, pre-certification audits.

Building upon the foundation laid in the 2018 legislative session and the guidance from the SAFE Commission's final report, House Bill 316 was introduced in the 2019 legislative session to authorize the purchase of a new voting system. HB 316 requires that in-person voting be conducted on ballot marking devices that print a voter handled verifiable paper ballot. It also requires that any new voting system be certified by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission. HB 316 passed the Georgia General Assembly on March 14, 2019.

With these directions from the Georgia General Assembly, the State Entity is releasing this Statewide Voting System eRFP.

Statistics

Polling Places: Approximately 2,364

Registered Voters: Approximately 7,060,000 (93% Active Status; 7% Inactive Status)

Ballots Cast in November 2016 General Election: 4,165,405

Ballots Cast in November 2018 General Election: 3,949,905

2018 General Election Turnout Breakdown:

- 46.03% of Electors Voted on Election Day
- 47.99% of Electors Voted During Absentee In-Person Voting (Advance Voting)
- 5.67% of Electors Voted Absentee by Mail
- 0.31% of Electors Voted Provisionally

2016 General Election Turnout Breakdown:

- 41.20% of Electors Voted on Election Day
- 53.54% of Electors Voted During Absentee In-Person Voting (Advance Voting)
- 5.07% of Electors Voted Absentee by Mail
- 0.19% of Electors Voted Provisionally

Election Structure

State law provides for a uniform voting system where every county uses the same type of voting equipment. Georgia has 159 counties and 159 election superintendents who run elections for each respective county. The GASOS maintains the Voter Registration System ("eNet"), builds ballots for each federal, state, and county election, and creates Electronic Poll Book ("EPoll") files.

Georgia has four methods of voting: absentee by mail voting using optical scan paper ballots, absentee in-person voting (three weeks of advance voting), provisional ballot voting, and Election Day voting. During absentee in-person voting, voters are able to vote in any advance voting location in their county, and on Election Day, voters must vote at their assigned polling place.

Federal, state, and county elections are held in even-numbered years. For partisan offices, there is a general primary and a general election. In order to win a primary, general, or special election in Georgia, a candidate must receive a majority of the votes cast for that office. If no candidate receives a majority of votes cast, a runoff election is held between the candidates with the two highest number of votes. Non-

partisan and judicial elections occur simultaneously and on the same ballot as the primaries in even-numbered years. Municipal elections usually occur in November of odd-numbered years, but some are held in even-numbered years.

SCOPE OF WORK

Overall Areas of Content to Emphasize in Responses

The more specifics and information each Supplier provides will better enable the State Entity's evaluation team to carry out its scoring and analysis. It is important to understand the overall intent of each section of the eRFP to ensure responses comply with the State Entity's requirements and show the overall experience that each Supplier can deliver.

A. Solution Requirements

1. The proposed SVS must have the functionality to support all 159 counties that will use the same equipment, software, and processes for creating, collecting, and tabulating votes. At a minimum, the proposed solution must be able to collect the following inputs and produce the following outputs:
 - Inputs
 - Contests to be voted on
 - Candidates or questions for each contest
 - District combos (define district-specific races for each specific voter)
 - Eligible voters
 - Outputs
 - Ballots
 - Election results
 - Voter participation and turnout
2. All other requirements to produce, maintain, and manage the SVS are included in the overall requirements of the eRFP. These include but are not limited to:
 - ADA accessibility
 - Application for creating ballots
 - Application for creating poll book datasets
 - Ballot Marking Devices ("BMDs") - ballot display and printing solutions
 - Electronic Poll Books ("EPolls")
 - Secure polling place ballot storage solution
 - Ballot counting solution
 - Application for result consolidation
 - Equipment for moving and storage of voting equipment and poll books
 - Training
 - User manuals and documentation
3. In-person (absentee in-person and Election Day) voting will be conducted solely with Ballot Marking Devices to mark ballots. Ballots marked using BMDs will be scanned and deposited into a secure ballot box. Provisional ballots will be available as required by law. To meet this requirement, the Supplier must deliver, during the first quarter of 2020, a minimum of:
 - Election Management System(s) ("EMS") needed for operation at the state level and 159 counties
 - Electronic Poll Book Data Management System(s) ("EPDMS") needed for operation at the state level and 159 counties

Statewide Voting System

eRFP Number: 47800-SOS0000037

- 30,050 Ballot Marking Devices (“BMDs”)
 - 8,000 Electronic Poll Books (“EPolls”)
 - 3,665 Total Scanners (consisting of 3,500 Polling Place Scanners (“PPS”) and 165 Central Scanning Devices (“CSD”))
 - All related hardware
4. Suppliers must provide definitions of the application programming interfaces (“APIs”) between the proposed SVS and external systems. These systems include:
 - Voter Registration System (“eNet”)
 - Election Management System (“EMS”)
 - Election Night Reporting (“ENR”)
 5. The interface should provide a system-to-system interface that does not require data manipulation or conversion by staff. Suppliers must define all data transfers that require secure storage media to bridge air-gap environments between eNet and the proposed SVS. Suppliers must also define data transfer processes for the following:
 - Inputs
 - Contests to be voted on
 - Candidates or questions for each contest
 - District Combos (define district-specific races for each specific voter)
 - Eligible Voters
 - Outputs
 - Ballots
 - Poll lists
 - Election results
 - Voter participation and turnout
 6. Suppliers must identify all security measures utilized to secure data entering and leaving the proposed SVS. Suppliers must identify all security measures used to protect data between the proposed SVS applications in the air-gapped environment (EMS and EPDMS) and SVS applications outside of the air-gapped environment (EPolls, BMDs).

A. State Certification and Acceptance Testing

The proposed SVS must pass GASOS certification and acceptance testing. Acceptance testing is a state-executed examination of each component of the SVS before the component can be distributed by the Supplier to any local jurisdiction. If a component fails acceptance testing, the component cannot be forwarded to its assigned jurisdiction. The failed component is returned to the Supplier along with information outlining the reason for failure.

If a component passes acceptance testing, the component can then be delivered to the assigned jurisdiction with its testing documentation.

B. Staging and Delivery Requirements

1. The Supplier must secure and provide a distribution facility (or facilities) in the state of Georgia to complete any final assembly and testing of SVS components. The facility (or facilities) must be secure and accessible by GASOS personnel for acceptance testing of all units prior to distribution to the counties. The Supplier must also propose staffing in terms of full time equivalents (FTEs) and their available resources for assembly, testing, and distribution efforts given the compressed delivery schedules required for this proposal.

Statewide Voting System

eRFP Number: 47800-SOS0000037

2. The Supplier should also propose and describe their plan to distribute equipment to the counties as part of their overall roll-out plan. The Supplier must design and describe the optimal plan of distribution, whether from one centralized distribution center or multiple regional distribution centers to cover delivery to all 159 counties and their secured facilities.

C. Company Background and Financial Capability

Suppliers must demonstrate stability and experience delivering similar projects to other customers by providing: case studies, references, company history, overall company resources, subcontractor or joint venture partner resources, previous experience implementing the proposed or similar solution with such subcontractor or joint venture partner, company organizational structure including number of employees/organizational chart, and the overall ability to execute this project. It is important to show company stability, sales levels, the necessary financial resources, and an overall ability to finance delivery, installation, buildout, implementation, support, maintenance, and all other requirements of the eRFP.

D. Hardware

Suppliers must provide specifications for equipment, equipment volume capacity (including all hardware required with the Supplier's system), any white papers, any environmental performance white papers, geographical locations where hardware is in use (including population numbers, density numbers, and customer experiences using the equipment). Provide overall system configurations and required equipment for each voting system or polling locations in exhibit form as well as a graphical description. Suppliers must also provide documented capability in all areas to ensure the ability to execute on this project deliverable.

E. Hardware Development

Each Supplier should describe its inventory on hand, inventory storage capacity, manufacturing capacity and ability to finance and deliver the state's necessary equipment levels. Suppliers should also include ability to deliver on future equipment enhancements, decommission current machines, and replace of hardware, excess inventory, and any specific advantages the Supplier may possess in delivering on this specific eRFP. For this and all key deliverables, Suppliers should include named resources and CVs for all key personnel including subcontractor or joint venture partner resources and previous experience implementing the proposed or similar solution with such subcontractor or joint venture partner.

F. Software Development

The Supplier should describe its company resources and financial commitment as a percentage of revenue, including overall development models, programming language and specifics, database modeling, lifecycle management, testing resources, and release management plan via white papers, models, and any other documentation to demonstrate domain expertise. For this and all key deliverables, include named resources and CVs for all key personnel including subcontractor or joint venture partner resources.

G. Consumables/Peripherals

It is important for the State Entity to understand the costs associated with peripherals and consumables for the proposed SVS and eventual purchase by local jurisdictions. Details should be provided for both equipment required peripherals and consumables with minimum unit pricing in a Master Services Level Agreement (MSLA); also be able to accommodate local jurisdiction aggregated purchases per Georgia law.

Statewide Voting System

eRFP Number: 47800-SOS0000037

H. Security

The proposed SVS must ensure security and ballot secrecy for all forms of voting (absentee by mail, absentee in-person, and in-person on Election Day). Additionally, the proposed SVS must integrate with the State Entity's current Voter Registration System ("eNet") (Vendor: PCC Technology Group) and integrate with the State Entity's current Election Night Reporting system ("ENR") (Vendor: Scytll). In addition to these overall requirements, the proposed SVS must have the following core functions:

- Creation of the election ballot styles
- A method for distribution of all ballot styles
- Creation of electronic poll book datasets for the election
- A method for distributing poll book datasets
- A method for access and use of poll books at polling locations
- Methods for presenting correct ballot to voter
- A method for documenting the ballot results
- A method for provisional balloting
- A method for counting ballots
- A method for tabulating all results
- Produce state, county, precinct, district, precinct combo, and municipal results
- Security for protecting data integrity
- A solution for maintaining chain of custody of ballots throughout the election process

Suppliers must provide details as to the security of your company and equipment including supply chain and ownership. This security overview should include specific software and cyber defenses in design, manufacturing, functionality, and delivery of all components of the offering. This should also include physical security capabilities on each component of the offering as well as tamper-evident properties of all aspects of the offering.

I. Implementation Plan

For the purposes of this eRFP, the Supplier's preliminary plan and estimates for delivery are to be in a phased roll-out as a pilot project and then a full roll-out to all counties.

Phase 1 will be the full inventory distribution and necessary training of up to ten (10) counties selected by GASOS to participate in a pilot project to be executed in November 2019. The pilot equipment will be used in any associated November 2019 election scheduled for the selected counties.

Phase 2 will be broken into two parts. Phase 2 – Part 1 will be distributing a minimum of five (5) BMD, two (2) PPS, and one (1) EMS computer to each county (159). These components will facilitate election official and poll worker training activities. Phase 2 – Part 2 will be the full distribution of all equipment to the counties including training. Phase 2 – Parts 1 and 2 will begin after the distribution of equipment to the counties participating in the scheduled pilot project in November 2019.

Completion of Phase 2 – Part 1 will be completed by end of the fourth quarter of 2019 (December 31, 2019). Completion of Phase 2 – Part 2 will be completed prior to the end of the first quarter of 2020 (March 31, 2020).

Suppliers should include detailed plans to demonstrate domain and project management expertise for the delivery and execution of the proposed SVS.

It is important that each Supplier's response to the eRFP display its company resources, project plans, implementation strategy including physical logistics and the overall ability to provide the necessary support to deliver this project to all 159 counties. Detailed project plans and project approaches for this and similar projects are important to the assessment. For this and all key deliverables, Suppliers should

Statewide Voting System

eRFP Number: 47800-SOS0000037

include named resources and CVs for all key personnel including subcontractor or joint venture partner resources.

J. Support

Suppliers must provide details for any additional support the Supplier will provide to supplement GASOS resources and counties, including replacement units and system parts, ballot building capability, call center resources, ticketing systems, Service Level Agreements (SLA), and any other core competencies the Supplier can offer to ensure project success with named resources and CVs for all key personnel.

K. Training

Suppliers must provide details for the training support the Supplier will provide to supplement GASOS and county resources. Include call center resources, staff training, training materials, and any other core competencies the Supplier would include in its eRFP response in order to ensure project success. For this and all key deliverables, include named resources and CVs for all key personnel including subcontractor resources.

L. Ease of Use

Suppliers must provide and demonstrate customer experiences via referrals and specific case studies or white papers including access, special features, and any other customer feedback that give the Supplier specific advantages over other voting equipment solutions.